



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,897	11/21/2003	Norimitsu Fukami	81707.0190	1430

26021 7590 10/30/2008
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.
1999 AVENUE OF THE STARS
SUITE 1400
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

EXAMINER

CHACKO DAVIS, DABORAH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1795

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/30/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/719,897	Applicant(s) FUKAMI ET AL.	
	Examiner DABORAH CHACKO DAVIS	Art Unit 1795	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 9-18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,143,116 (Hayashi et al., hereinafter referred to as Hayashi) in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,159,322 (Ogata et al., hereinafter referred to as Ogata).

Hayashi, in the abstract, in col 2, lines 65-67, in col 3, lines 1-20, in col 7, lines 60-67, in col 8, lines 1-59, in col 13, lines 1-62, in col 15, lines 1-67, in col 16, lines 1-32, discloses a method of forming a multi-layer circuit board comprising forming a circuit pattern on a transfer sheet (transparent carrier film, the circuit pattern being non-transmitting), forming a slurry of photocurable material (the slurry containing an electrically insulating ceramic material such as an inorganic filler material) on the circuit patterned insulating board, and photocuring the slurry material by irradiation with light via the back side of the transfer sheet, developing the non-cured portions (immersing in solution), adhering the insulating board with the circuit pattern to that of the circuit layer on the transfer sheet (or ceramic green sheet, with through holes filled with conducting paste) and laminating by pressing and heat curing (lamination done such that the transfer sheet and substrate are opposed to each other i.e., the circuitry face each

Art Unit: 1795

other), repeating the process by preparing multiple insulating boards, in the method described above, with circuit patterns, and adhering the boards with transfer sheets comprising the wiring circuit layer, and laminating the circuit parts together by pressing and heat curing, followed by peeling the transfer sheets (see figures 2(A) through 2(D), and 4(D)) to form the multi-layer circuit laminate. Hayashi, in col 16, lines 1-15, discloses that the desired wiring pattern is transferred to the insulating layer (cured portions remain, and non-patterned portions are removed) (claims 9-10, 18). Hayashi, in col 6, lines 22-25, and in col 15, lines 40-60, discloses that the photocured ceramic sheet (insulating board with the wiring circuit pattern layer) can have total thickness not larger than $50\mu\text{m}$ ($10\mu\text{m}$ insulating board + $12\mu\text{m}$ copper foil thickness = $22\mu\text{m}$), and the difference in thickness between the circuit pattern thickness and the insulating board (thickness difference between the circuit-forming pattern and the photo cured ceramic sheet) is less than $5\mu\text{m}$ i.e., $2\mu\text{m}$ (claim 11). Hayashi, in col 15, lines 41-56, discloses that the circuit-forming pattern (patterned wiring circuit layer) is an electrically conducting material such as a metal foil (claims 12, and 14). Hayashi, in col 7, lines 60-67, in col 8, lines 1-59, discloses that the insulating board can comprise conductive wiring that comprises a conductive paste made of a metal powder and an organic binder resin (claim 13). Hayashi, in col 7, lines 60-67, in col 8, lines 1-67, and in col 15, lines 42-60, discloses that the circuit forming pattern (circuit wiring) and the insulating board composition (thermosetting resin, thermally curable i.e., thermally disintegrating resin or thermally extinguishing pattern) are so formed that the circuit wiring pattern and the thermosetting resin pattern (insulating board composition, is inherently opaque) forming

Art Unit: 1795

a single layer of insulating board with circuit wiring in it and that they (circuit pattern and thermally extinguishing pattern) are not overlapped but rather embedded or buried in the layer (see figure 2(A)) (claims 15-16). Hayashi, in col 9, lines 24-37, and in figures 1, and 2(D), discloses that the surface roughness of the insulating board is not smaller than $1\mu\text{m}$ (i.e., surface roughness is not smaller than from 0.3 to $3\mu\text{m}$), and that the laminate is formed with roughened surfaces opposing each other (claim 17).

The difference between the claims and Hayashi is that Hayashi does not disclose firing the laminate.

Ogata, in col 19, lines 19-25, discloses after the completion of the multi-layer circuit board laminate, the laminate is fired in a firing furnace.

Therefore, it would be obvious to a skilled artisan to modify Hayashi by employing the process of firing after lamination as suggested by Ogata because Ogata, in col 1, lines 6-15, and in col 19, lines 19-35, discloses that firing the laminate results in a multi-layer fired ceramic board with high density and enables an increase in the mechanical strength of the substrate in the multi-layer circuit board.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed August 13, 2008, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The 103 rejection made in the previous office action (paper no.20080303) is maintained.

A) Applicants argue that Hayashi does not teach a photocurable slurry, and that the material applied is not photocurable but a thermosetting resin that is not photocurable.

Art Unit: 1795

Hayashi, in col 5, lines 2-9, discloses that the resin is a polyimide resin, and polyimide resin is inherently photosensitive.

B) Applicants argue that Hayashi does not teach photocuring the photocurable ceramic coating layer which is not present on the circuit forming pattern, and that the photocurable ceramic coating layer which is present on the circuit forming pattern is not photocured.

Hayashi, in col 15, lines 40-67, and in col 16, lines 1-31, discloses the use of slurry that has an inorganic filler i.e., an electrically insulating material, and that the slurry is a polyimide resin i.e., the slurry is photocurable and is applied on the transfer sheet wherein the transfer sheet has a wiring circuit pattern formed on its surface. The slurry is not selectively applied, it is applied on the entire surface i.e., on the circuit pattern (wiring pattern) and in the via holes on the transfer sheet, and exposed to light through the back surface of the transfer sheet, i.e., the slurry in the via holes are photocured, whereas the slurry disposed on the wiring pattern is masked from the irradiation and is therefore unexposed i.e., not photocured.

C) Applicants argue that the illustration in the page 13 is not taught by Hayashi, and that Hayashi's slurry does not fill the gap between the circuit patterns.

The claims do not recite what is illustrated, and the claim recitations are disclosed by Hayashi. The claims do not recite filling the gaps between the circuit patterns with a slurry. Hayashi teaches applying the slurry on a circuit patterned insulating board.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daborah Chacko-Davis whose telephone number is (571) 272-1380. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30 - 6:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark F Huff can be reached on (571) 272-1385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you

Art Unit: 1795

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Daborah Chacko-Davis/
Examiner, Art Unit 1795

October 27, 2008.